REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-16, 18-33, and 46-50 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 26, and 46 has been amended. No further claims have been added or canceled.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for courtesy of the telephone interview on August 4, 2010, in which the Examiner indicated that certain claim amendments would overcome the current 103 rejection. Applicants have amended the claims to correspond to the language which the Examiner agreed was novel over the references cited. The Examiner suggested submitting these claim changes in an After Final amendment. Applicants hereby submit the After Final amendment in accordance with the Examiner's recommendation. If a telephone conference would assist in moving this case to allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at 408-720-8300.

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Applicants have amended the claims. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 26, and 46, as amended, provide proper antecedent basis for all claim elements. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the objection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16, 18-33, and 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of WO 00/72534 A1 (Rabe-Hesketh et al), U.S. Patent No. 6,742,043 (Moussa et al), and U.S. Patent No. 6,311,215 (Bakshi et al.).

Rabe-Hesketh discloses removing an email attachment and replacing the attachment with a link in the email. The link references the original attachment stored in a server available for later retrieval. Nonetheless, as correctly stated in the Office action,

Rabe-Hesketh fails to disclose or suggest formatting attachments based on a user's formatting preference.

Moussa is directed at reformatting and delivering a requested attachment based on information indicative of an email client's capability (Moussa, Col. 16, lines 28-31). The email client makes a request for an email along with information indicative of the email client's capability (Moussa, col. 16, lines 34-46). The email server reformats the email attachment and sends the email with the reformatted email attachment to the email client (Moussa, col. 16, lines 50-62). However, Moussa does not disclose substituting a link in the email to the reformatted attachment in place of the reformatted attachment.

Bakshi discloses software a user uses to determine download preferences (Bakshi, Fig. 3, Col. 7, lines 7-40). The download preferences are used to indicate a preference for transcoding by a network proxy that sends content to the network client (Bakshi, Col. 7, lines 19-28). These preferences are sent to a network proxy either before or when the network client requests content (Col. 3, lines 30-47). This software is downloaded from a network proxy or transcoding server (Col. 8, lines 5-15). Thus, Bakshi discloses a network client that sends user set transformation parameters with a request to download content. However, Bakshi does not teach or suggest a link for the requested content that is invoked by the network client that includes transcoding preferences.

Claim 1 as amended recites:

In an online messaging system supporting transmission of attachments, a method for automatically processing e-mail messages containing attachments, the method comprising:

specifying a preference for formatting attachments that accompany e-mail messages;

receiving, with a server, a particular e-mail message having a particular attachment;

detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message, and the receiving device is one of a plurality of receiving devices known to the intended recipient;

<u>determining a least common denominator format for the particular attachment, wherein the least common denominator format is a format that is compatible with the plurality of known receiving devices for said intended recipient;</u>

responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the particular attachment as exceeding capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, removing the particular attachment from the particular message, and inserting a link into the particular e-mail message, <u>said link capable of referencing a reformatted attachment based on the determined least common denominator format;</u>

delivering the particular e-mail message to the intended recipient; and

in response to invocation of the link by the intended recipient, receiving a request for a copy of the reformatted attachment, wherein the request includes an identification of the reformatted attachment.

(Claim 1, as amended, emphasis added) Claim 1 recites a link in an email referencing a reformatted email attachment that "determining a least common denominator format for the particular attachment, wherein the least common denominator format is a format that is compatible with the plurality of known receiving devices for said intended recipient" and a "link capable of referencing a reformatted attachment based on the determined least common denominator format." This feature is supported in the Specification as originally filed, for example at page 17, line 28 – page 18, line 3.

Rabe-Hesketh discloses referencing an original email attachment. Because this reference is to the original attachment, and not an attachment that is the least common

denominator of a plurality of target devices, Applicants respectfully submits that Rabe-Hesketh does not teach or suggest the claimed elements.

Furthermore, Moussa discloses substituting a reformatted email attachment based on the capability of the device requesting the email. However, Moussa does not disclose reformatting that email attachment based on a least common denominator of a plurality of target devices. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Moussa does not teach or suggest "determining a least common denominator format for the particular attachment, wherein the least common denominator format is a format that is compatible with the plurality of known receiving devices for said intended recipient" and a "link capable of referencing a reformatted attachment based on the determined least common denominator format" as claimed in claim 1.

In addition, Bakshi discloses a network client that sends user determined transformation parameters with a request to download content. Because these transformation parameters are user determined and are not based on the least common denominator of a plurality of target devices of a recipient, Applicants respectfully submit that Bakshi does not teach or suggest the claimed elements.

Thus, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests "determining a least common denominator format for the particular attachment, wherein the least common denominator format is a format that is compatible with the plurality of known receiving devices for said intended recipient" and a "link capable of referencing a reformatted attachment based on the determined least common denominator format" as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1, and claims 2-25 that depend on claim 1, is not obvious over the combination of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, and Bakshi.

Claim 26 as amended recites:

> In an online system, a method for providing digital images to target devices, the method comprising:
> receiving, with a server, an e-mail message having one or more attached objects;
> detecting capabilities of one of the target devices, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient of that target device to retrieve the e-mail message;
> responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the objects as exceeding capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, detaching said objects from said message, and that target device is one of a plurality of receiving devices known to the intended recipient;
> <u>determining a least common denominator format for each of the one or more attached objects, wherein the least common denominator format for that object is a format that is compatible with the plurality of known receiving devices for said intended recipient;</u>
> for each detached object, generating a request allowing retrieval of a transformed copy of the detached object, wherein the generated request includes an identification of includes an identification of the transformed copy of the detached object;
> <u>automatically transforming copies of each of said objects to a resolution fidelity that is more useful to said one of the target devices based on the determined least common denominator format for that detached object; and</u>
> delivering the e-mail message to the one of the target devices, the e-mail message including said generated request for each detached object.

(Claim 26, as amended, emphasis added). As noted above, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests "determining a least common denominator format for each of the one or more attached objects, wherein the least common denominator format for that object is a format that is compatible with the plurality of known receiving devices for said intended recipient" and "automatically transforming copies of each of said objects to a resolution fidelity that is more useful to said one of the target devices based on the determined least common denominator

format for that detached object" as claimed in claim 26. Therefore, claim 26, and claims

27-33 that depend on claim 26, is not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, and Bakshi.

Claim 46 recites:

An e-mail system for providing e-mail having attachments, the system
comprising:
　　an e-mail server for:
　　　　receiving a particular e-mail message having an attachment, the
particular e-mail message being addressed to a recipient having a target device
capable of receiving e-mail, the attachment including one or more objects, and
　　　　detecting capabilities of the target device, wherein the detecting is
performed dynamically, during a request from the recipient to retrieve the e-mail
message, and the target device is one of a plurality of receiving devices known to
the recipient;
　　　　<u>a media converter module to determine a least common denominator
format for each of the one or more objects, wherein the least common
denominator format for that object is a format that is compatible with the plurality
of known receiving devices for said intended recipient;</u>
　　　　<u>a transformation module for transforming each of the objects of the
attachment to a desired format, based on capabilities of the target device and the
determined least common denominator object for that object;</u>
　　　　an attachment processing module for replacing the attachment with at
least one request responsive to detecting the target device and responsive to
identifying the attachment as exceeding capabilities of the target device, wherein
the at least one request allows retrieval of at least one of the transformed objects
and the at least one request includes an identification of the at least one of the
transformed objects; and
　　　　a retrieval module allowing retrieval of the transformed objects, in
response to invocation of at least one request.

(Claim 46, as amended, emphasis added). As noted above, none of Rabe-

Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests "a media converter module to

determine a least common denominator format for each of the one or more objects,

wherein the least common denominator format for that object is a format that is

compatible with the plurality of known receiving devices for said intended recipient ...a

transformation module for transforming each of the objects of the attachment to a

desired format, based on capabilities of the target device and the determined least

common denominator object for that object." Therefore, claim 46 and claims 47-50 that depend on claim 46 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, and Bakshi.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: August 10, 2010

Eric S. Replogle
Reg. No. 52,161

Customer No. 08791
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300